Case 5:18-cv-02144 Document 1 Filed 10/08/18 Page 1 of 7 Page ID #:1

12 13

14

15 **16**

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27 28

Plaintiff, Joseph Jacobs (hereafter "Plaintiff"), by undersigned counsel, brings the following complaint against Atlantic Credit and Finance, Inc. (hereafter "Defendant") and alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION

- This action arises out of Defendant's violations of the Fair Debt 1. Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. ("FDCPA"), and violations of the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1788, et seq. ("Rosenthal Act").
- Jurisdiction of this Court arises under 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), Cal. Civ. 2. Code 1788.30(f), 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- Venue is proper before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), where 3. the acts and transactions giving rise to Plaintiff's action occurred in this district and/or where Defendant transacts business in this district.

PARTIES

- 4. Plaintiff is an adult individual residing in Aliso Viejo, California, and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39) and Cal Civ. Code § 1788.2(g).
- Plaintiff is a "consumer" as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3), and is a 5. "debtor" as defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.2(h).
- Defendant is a business entity located in Roanoke, Virginia, and is a 6. "person" as the term is defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39) and Cal Civ. Code § 1788.2(g).

- 7. Defendant uses instrumentalities of interstate commerce or the mails in a business the principle purpose of which is the collection of debts and/or regularly collects or attempts to collect debts owed or asserted to be owed to another, and is a "debt collector" as defined by 15 U.S.C.§ 1692a(6).
- 8. Defendant, in the ordinary course of business, regularly, on behalf of itself or others, engages in the collection of consumer debts, and is a "debt collector" as defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.2(c).

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

- 9. Plaintiff is a natural person allegedly obligated to pay a debt asserted to be owed to a creditor other than Defendant.
- 10. Plaintiff's alleged obligation arises from a transaction in which property, services or money was acquired on credit primarily for personal, family or household purposes, is a "debt" as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5), and is a "consumer debt" as defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.2(f).
- 11. At all times mentioned herein where Defendant communicated with any person via telephone, such communication was done via Defendant's agent, representative or employee.
- 12. On or about July 31, 2018, Defendant called Plaintiff and during the live conversation that ensued, Defendant failed to notify Plaintiff that it was a debt collector calling in an attempt to collect a debt.

- 13. In addition, Defendant misrepresented that it would initiate legal action if Plaintiff did not make an immediate payment.
- 14. When Plaintiff questioned Defendant's information, Defendant abruptly terminated the call.
- 15. Immediately following, Defendant called Plaintiff's spouse and disclosed that it was attempting to collect a debt from Plaintiff.
- 16. Defendant's actions caused Plaintiff to suffer a significant amount of stress, anxiety and embarrassment.

COUNT I

VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.

- 17. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 18. The FDCPA was passed in order to protect consumers from the use of abusive, deceptive and unfair debt collection practices and in order to eliminate such practices.
- 19. Defendant attempted to collect a debt from Plaintiff and engaged in "communications" as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).
- 20. Defendant communicated with a person other than Plaintiff and stated that Plaintiff owes a debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692b(2).

- 21. Defendant communicated with a person other than Plaintiff, Plaintiff's attorney, or a consumer-reporting agency regarding Plaintiff's alleged debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(b).
- 22. Defendant used false, deceptive, or misleading representations or means in connection with the collection of a debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.
- 23. Defendant threatened to take action that could not be legally taken or that Defendant did not intend to take, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(5).
- 24. Defendant used false representations or deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect a debt or obtain information concerning the Plaintiff, in violation of 15 U.S.C.§ 1692e(10).
- 25. Defendant's agent communicated with Plaintiff and failed to disclose that he/she was a debt collector and/or that he/she was attempting to collect a debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(11).
- 26. The foregoing acts and/or omissions of Defendant constitute multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.
- 27. Plaintiff was harmed and is entitled to damages as a result of Defendant's violations.

<u>COUNT II</u>

VIOLATIONS OF THE ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT, Cal. Civ. Code § 1788, et seq.

- 28. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 29. The Rosenthal Act was passed to prohibit debt collectors from engaging in unfair and deceptive acts and practices in the collection of consumer debts.
- 30. Defendant communicated with Plaintiff's family regarding the alleged consumer debt and for a purpose other than to locate the Plaintiff, in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.12(b).
- 31. Defendant falsely represented that a legal proceeding had been or was about to be instituted unless the alleged consumer debt was paid, in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.13(j).
- 32. Defendant did not comply with the provisions of 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.*, in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.17.
- 33. Plaintiff was harmed and is entitled to damages as a result of Defendant's violations.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendant for:

- A. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- B. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. \$1692k(a)(2)(A);
- C. Actual damages pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(a);

	Case 5:18-cv-02144 Document 1 Filed 10/08/18 Page 7 of 7 Page ID #:7	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	violations pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(b); E. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 15 U § 1692k(a)(3) and Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(c); F. Punitive damages; and G. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.	
11	1	
12 13	DATED: October8, 2018 TRINETTE G. KENT	
14 15 16	Trinette G. Kent, Esq. Lemberg Law, LLC	
17 18	7	
19 20		
21 22		
23 24		
25 26		
27 28		